

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 2605 of 1997

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

VIBHABHAI VAJABHAI BHARWAD

Versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Appearance:

MS DR KACHHAVAH for Petitioner
Mr.LR POOJARI, A.G.P. for Respondent No. 1, 3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

Date of decision: 02/05/97

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. By way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India the petitioner-detenu has brought under challenge the detention order dated 18th January 1997 rendered by respondent No.1 u/s.3(1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-social Activities Act, 1985 (Act No.16 of 1985), for short "the PASA Act".

2. The grounds on which the impugned order of detention passed appear at Annexure : B to the petition. They inter alia indicate that the petitioner has been indulging in criminal and anti-social activities of causing hurt to the witnesses with deadly weapon and committing various offences under the Indian Penal Code resulting in fear in the mind of people. The Detaining Authority has placed reliance upon three offences, two of 1995 and one of 1996 under the various provisions of Indian Penal Code registered in Rajkot Taluka Police Station, Rajkot. The particulars of such offences have been set out in the grounds of detention.

The first case of 1995 is inter-alia u/s. 323 I.P.C. The Second case of 1995 includes the provisions of Section 325 and 302 I.P.C., but the particulars of the case would indicate that the F.I.R. was registered on 30.5.1995 and it is jointly submitted that the petitioner was bailed out on 28.9.1995. The third case is of 1996 and is inter-alia under Sections 323 and 324 I.P.C.

3. It has been recited that the detenu's anti-social activity tends to obstruct maintenance of public order and in support of such conclusion statements of three witnesses have been relied upon. They speak about the incidents dated 29.10.1996, 17.11.1996 and 20.12.1996 indicating threatening the concerned witnesses, creating atmosphere of fear amongst the people collected at the time of such incidents.

4. It is on the aforesaid incidents that the detaining authority has passed the impugned order of detention while also relying upon the aforesaid cases lodged against the petitioner. The petitioner has been stamped as a dangerous person within the meaning of section 2(c) of the PASA Act.

5. I have heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner and the learned A.G.P. for the State. The petitioner has challenged the aforesaid order of detention on number of grounds inter-alia on the ground that there is no material to indicate that the detenu's conduct would show that he is habitually engaged in the anti-social activities which can be said to be prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. This is a case of individual incidents affecting law and order and in the facts of the case would not amount to leading to conclusion that the same would affect public order. Reliance has been placed on the following decision of the Apex Court :-

Mustakmiya Jabbarmiya Shaikh v/s. M.M.Mehta,
C.P. reported in 1995 (2) G.L.R. 1268, where
the incidents were quoted in paras : 11 and 12
of the citation and it has been submitted that
facts of the present case run almost parallel to
the facts before the Apex Court in Mustakmiya's
case (supra).

6. In reply Mr.L.R.Poojari, learned A.G.P. for the
State has relied upon a decision in the case of Mrs.
Harpreet Kaur Harvinder Singh Bedi v/s. State of
Maharashtra and anr., reported in AIR 1992 SC 979.
Comparing the facts of the present case with the facts in
the case before the Supreme Court, it clearly appears
that the decision in Mrs.Harpreet Kaur's case (Supra)
would not be applicable.

7. There are other grounds of challenge levelled
against the impugned order of detention. However, in
view of the fact that the petitioner would succeed on the
strength of decision of Mustakmiya's case (supra), it is
not necessary to deal with the other grounds. Hence,
following order is passed :

8. The impugned order of detention is hereby quashed
and set aside. The petitioner-detenu Vibhabhai Vajabhai
Bharwad shall be forthwith set at liberty if he is not
required to be detained in any other case. Rule made
absolute accordingly.

* * * * *